

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 19, 2004. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination, and have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. The specification has been amended to address the objection made in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9-11 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,678,733 B1 (Brown et al.). Applicant submits, however, that the independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom, are all patentable over that document, for at least the following reasons.

As is described in the application, the present invention relates to network systems in which access to certain settings on a server must be denied to most users in the interest of ensuring that the settings, made by an authorized administrator, are not inadvertently changed by someone without authorization. In conventional systems, however, the amount of information provided to the user by means of an error code is very scanty, and it would be desirable to provide the user with a more-detailed explanation that is usual about the reason for such a denial of access.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a network-connectable apparatus that comprises a judging device adapted to judge whether or not access by another apparatus should be restricted, and a sending device adapted to send information for describing a screen image which indicates in that other apparatus the reason for the access restriction, if access by the other apparatus is restricted.

By this means, the apparatus of Claim 1 provides a user with as much information as the system administrators wish as to the reason for the denial of access, and the content of the information can be changed as often as is wished.

*Brown* relates to a system in which servers providing network-based services are accessed via a walled garden proxy server ("WGPS"). A user (client) sends a request for such a service to the WGPS, including a number identifying the desired service and a ticket that grants the client access. If no ticket is presented, or if the ticket is invalid, the WGPS denies access (see Figs. 4 and 6). In response to a denial of access, the client can send a message to a gateway server to request a ticket, and the gateway server, upon receipt of sufficient authenticating information from the client, issues an appropriate ticket, which is returned to the client, who in turn submits the ticket to the WGPS to gain access to the desired service.

As described in *Brown*, denial of access by the WGPS is communicated by issuing a HTTP status response to the client with an HTTP header that indicates the reason for denying access (col. 13, lines 21-25). Applicant submits, however, that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *brown* that would teach or suggest sending information that describes a screen image that indicates a reason for an access restriction, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, only an HTTP header is mentioned. For at least that reason, Claim 1 is deemed to be clearly allowable over *Brown*.

Independent Claim 4 is directed to a network-connectable apparatus that comprises a judging device adapted to judge whether or not access by another apparatus should be restricted, and a decision device adapted to decide whether or not information for describing a screen image in that other apparatus is stored in the network-

connectable apparatus and has been updated, based on time information related to the information possessed by the other apparatus. Also provided in the apparatus of Claim 4 is a sending device adapted to send the information for describing a screen image which displays a status of the network-connectable apparatus according to the judgment made by the judging device and the decision results provided by the decision device.

As discussed above, nothing has been found in *Brown* that would teach or suggest the use of information describing a screen image to communicate a reason for a denial of access. Still less is anything in that patent seen to teach or suggest deciding whether or not such information is stored and has been updated based on time information related to that information and possessed by the device that is seeking access, as recited in Claim 4. Accordingly, it is also believed to be clear that Claim 4 is allowable over *Brown*.

Independent Claim 6 is directed to a network system connected with a plurality of computers and a plurality of network apparatus, in which one of the computers is equipped with a Web client, and another of the computers and one of the network apparatus are equipped with a Web server. The system of Claim 6 comprises a determination device adapted to determine to restrict access to the Web servers, and a notification device adapted to send information for describing a first screen image which displays in the Web client that access to the Web server is restricted, to the Web client if it has been determined to restrict access to the Web server.

Again, nothing has been found in *Brown* that would teach or suggest the use of information that describes a first screen image that displays in a web client that access to a Web server is restricted, in response to a determination to restrict access, as

recited in Claim 6, and that claim also is believed to be clearly allowable over that patent.

Each of the other independent claims is a method claim corresponding to one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as are presented above in connection with the corresponding apparatus or system claims.


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Leonard P. Diana", written in black ink.

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

NY\_MAIN 483109v1